

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 STATE 058907

73

ORIGIN EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 NEA-10 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 DODE-00 OMB-01 ACDA-19 AID-20 IGA-02 MC-02 H-03

SS-20 /148 R

DRAFTED BY OASD/ISA:CVMCLAUGHLIN:GP

APPROVED BY EUR/RPM:EJSTREATOR, JR.

OASD/ISA:BGGEN. HLOBDELL

OASD/PA AND E:MR. WOODS

PM/ISP:JGRAHAM

NEA/TUR:HKIRBY (INFO)

EUR/RPM:LTC RTHOMPSON

EUR/RPM:WROMINE:ACFLOYD

----- 071539

P R 232255Z MAR 74

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

INFO AMEMBASSY ANKARA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USDELMC

S E C R E T STATE 058907

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: MCAP, NATO, TU

SUBJECT: NATO FORCE PROPOSALS/GOALS 1975-80 TURKEY

REF: (A) STATE 42348, (B) MCM-14-74, (C) USNATO 1262

SECTION I. INTRODUCTION.

1. THIS MESSAGE PROVIDES SPECIFIC GUIDANCE FOR MISSION USE DURING CONTINUING DRC REVIEW OF TURKISH FORCE PROPOSALS/GOALS. THE GENERAL APPROACH USED IN DEVELOPING THIS GUIDANCE WAS DESCRIBED IN REF (A). FYI: WE REITERATE THAT SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 STATE 058907

THE CONCEPT EMPLOYED IN ARRIVING AT US PROPOSED FORCE GOALS

DOES NOT ATTEMPT TO SUPPLANT THE MILITARY CONSIDERATIONS EXPRESSED AS MC PRIORITIES IN FORCE PROPOSALS. RATHER, IT USES THOSE PROPOSALS AS A DEPARTURE POINT TO INTERWEAVE ECONOMIC, POLITICAL, AND USG POLICY CONSIDERATIONS INTO THE FORCE PLANNING PROCESSES OF THE ALLIANCE. END FYI.

2. AS DESCRIBED IN REF (A), OUR "REASONABLE CHALLENGE" FOR NATO COUNTRIES WAS DEFINED AS THE INCREMENTAL FUNDS -- OVER AND ABOVE CURRENT NATIONAL EXPENDITURE PLANS -- THAT COUNTRIES WOULD HAVE DURING 1975-80 IF THEY MAINTAINED THEIR CURRENT PERCENTAGE OF GNP DEVOTED TO DEFENSE. IN THE CASE OF TURKEY OUR "REASONABLE CHALLENGE" WOULD BE AN ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURE OF 10,053 MILLION TURKISH LIRA, OR AN INCREASE OF ABOUT TWELVE PERCENT OVER AND ABOVE OUR PROJECTION OF CURRENTLY PLANNED 1975-80 EXPENDITURES (80,378 MILLION TURKISH LIRA).

3. WE HAVE ALSO FOLLOWED THE PROCEDURE DESCRIBED IN REF A FOR DISTILLING A U.S. PROPOSED LIST OF PRIORITY ONE FORCE GOALS OUT OF REF B. IN THE CASE OF TURKEY, NARROWING THE CRITERIA FOR PRIORITY ONE TO THOSE FORCE PROPOSALS WHICH SEEM TO ADVANCE NATO'S FORCE STRUCTURE TOWARDS THE OBJECTIVES EMPHASIZED BY SECRETARY SCHLESINGER HAS RESULTED IN THE PROPOSED FORCE GOALS INCLUDED BELOW IN TABLES III-1 THROUGH -3.

4. WE ASSUME MISSION WILL WORK CLOSELY WITH DELEGATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL STAFF IN CARRYING OUT APPROPRIATE MISSIONARY WORK.

5. THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS PROVIDE DETAILS ON THE FORCE PROPOSALS FOR TURKEY.

SECTION II: COMPUTATION OF "REASONABLE CHALLENGE" EXPENDITURE TARGETS FOR TURKEY.

1. THIS SECTION DESCRIBES THE PROCESS USED TO ESTABLISH OUR REASONABLE CHALLENGE EXPENDITURE TARGETS FOR TURKEY. A SUMMARY OF THE KEY STEPS IS PRESENTED BELOW FOLLOWED BY A GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF DATA SOURCES AND ASSUMPTIONS. 1972 CONSTANT PRICES, TURKISH LIRA IN MILLIONS:

(1)	(2)	(3)
PROJECTED 1975-80 GNP	PERCENTAGE CURRENTLY DEVOTED TO	1975-80 DEFENSE EXPENDITURES TARGET BASED ON MAINTAINING SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 STATE 058907

DEFENSE	CURRENT PERCENTAGE
1,903,805	4.75 PERCENT
90,431	
(4)	(5)
(6)	
PROJECTED 1975-80 DEFENSE EXPENDITURES BASED ON CURRENT GET AND NATIONAL	"REASONABLE CHALLENGE" (DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TARGET AND NATIONAL DITURES BASED ON

NATIONAL PLANS	PLANS)	NATIONAL PLANS
----------------	--------	----------------

80,378	10,053	12.5 PERCENT
--------	--------	--------------

SUMMARY OF KEY STEPS

2. FIRST, WE PROJECTED TOTAL TURKISH GNP FOR 1975 THROUGH 1980 (COL. 1). NEXT, WE DETERMINED THE TOTAL FUNDS THAT WOULD BE AVAILABLE FOR DEFENSE DURING 1975-1980 IF TURKEY ADHERED TO MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE CALLING FOR NATIONS TO ALLOCATE AT LEAST A CONSTANT SHARE OF THEIR NATIONAL WEALTH, I.E., THEIR GNP, TO DEFENSE (COL. 3). WE THEN DETERMINED WHAT FUNDS TURKEY WOULD HAVE AVAILABLE FOR DEFENSE DURING 1975-1980 BASED ON CURRENT NATIONAL EXPENDITURE PLANS (COL. 4). WE ASSUMED THAT THE FORCE PROPOSALS ALREADY IN NATIONAL FORCE PLANS WOULD BE FUNDED OUT OF THE AMOUNTS SHOWN IN COL. 4 AND

THAT ADDITIONAL FUNDING, OVER AND ABOVE THE AMOUNTS SHOWN IN COL. 4, WOULD BE NECESSARY TO FUND ANY ADDITIONAL FORCE PROPOSALS (OTHER THAN NO COST/LOW COST PROPOSALS). COLUMN 5 IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TOTAL DEFENSE EXPENDITURES BASED ON MAINTAINING THE CURRENT GNP PERCENTAGE (COL. 3) AND TOTAL DEFENSE EXPENDITURES BASED ON CURRENT NATIONAL EXPENDITURE PLANS (COL. 4). THIS FIGURE (TL 10,1 BILLION) REPRESENTS OUR PROPOSED REASONABLE CHALLENGE, THE INCREMENTAL AMOUNT TURKEY WOULD BE EXPECTED TO DEVOTE TO DEFENSE TO FUND PRIORITY ONE FORCE PROPOSALS THAT ARE NOT ALREADY IN COUNTRY PLANS. COLUMN 6 SHOWS OUR PROPOSED REASONABLE CHALLENGE (COL. 5) AS A PERCENT OF DEFENSE EXPENDITURES BASED ON CURRENT NATIONAL EXPENDITURE PLANS (COL. 4). THIS PERCENTAGE INDICATES THE MAGNITUDE OF THE ADDITIONAL EFFORT THAT WOULD BE REQUIRED TO MEET THE PROPOSED REASONABLE CHALLENGE.

DATA SOURCES AND ASSUMPTIONS

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 STATE 058907

3. PRICE BASE: ALL COMPUTATIONS WERE DEVELOPED ON THE BASIS OF 1972 CONSTANT PRICES. THIS WAS THE PRICE BASE USED BY SHAPE TECHNICAL CENTER IN ITS COST ESTIMATES OF THE FORCE PROPOSALS.

4. GNP PROJECTIONS (COL. 1): GNP PROJECTIONS ARE BASED ON THE FORECASTS PROVIDED IN NATO DOCUMENT DPC/D(73)23 (TURKEY) ADJUSTED TO REFLECT INFORMATION FROM OTHER SOURCES. BASED ON INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM USG AGENCIES, WE ESTIMATED THAT 1974 GNP WOULD REPRESENT A 7.5 PERCENT INCREASE IN REAL TERMS OVER 1973. TURKEY'S ECONOMY IS NOT HIGHLY DEPENDENT ON OIL, THEREFORE, IT IS ANTICIPATED THAT THE CURRENT ENERGY CRISIS WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON TURKISH GNP GROWTH. WE ASSUMED THAT IN 1975 TURKISH GNP WOULD ACHIEVE THE 7.9 PERCENT GROWTH RATE PROJECTED IN DPC/D(73)23 AND THAT

THIS GROWTH RATE WOULD BE MAINTAINED THROUGH 1980.

5. CURRENT GNP PERCENTAGE DEVOTED TO DEFENSE (COL. 2):

THIS FIGURE, CALCULATED USING THE GNP PERCENTAGES SHOWN

IN NATO DOCUMENT ISM(73)11, REPRESENTS THE AVERAGE OF TURKEY'S 1972 AND 1973 GNP PERCENTAGES. SINCE GNP PERCENTAGES WILL FLUCTUATE FROM YEAR TO YEAR AND SINCE 1973 DATA IS STILL SUBJECT TO CHANGE, THE AVERAGE FOR THE TWO MOST RECENT YEARS, 1972 AND 1973, WAS CONSIDERED TO BE A MORE REPRESENTATIVE INDICATION OF A COUNTRY'S RECENT EFFORT THAN EITHER 1972 OR 1973 ALONE.

6. TOTAL DEFENSE EXPENDITURES BASED ON CURRENT NATIONAL PLANS (COL. 4): THESE PROJECTIONS WERE DERIVED FROM INFORMATION PROVIDED IN DPC/D(73)23 AND FROM INFORMATION PROVIDED BY U.S. MISSION NATO WHICH INDICATED A 3.8 PERCENT PER YEAR REAL GROWTH FOR 1974 AND BEYOND.

(DPC/D(73)23 DOES NOT PROVIDE A SPECIFIC FIGURE FOR REAL GROWTH IN TURKISH 1973 DEFENSE EXPENDITURES. ACCORDINGLY, WE ESTIMATED THIS FIGURE TO BE 10.7 PERCENT BASED ON THE GNP DEFLATOR SHOWN IN DPC/D(73)23.)

SECTION III: PRIORITY ONE DRAFT GOALS FOR TURKEY

1. BY THE PROCEDURE DETAILED IN REF A WE HAVE IDENTIFIED PROPOSALS WHICH MEET THE SECDEF CRITERIA. THESE WERE GIVEN U.S. PRIORITY ONE, INDEPENDENT OF THE MC PRIORITY.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 05 STATE 058907

IF COSTS WERE INCLUDED WITHIN COUNTRY PLANS, A LETTER C APPEARS IN THE COST COLUMN OF EACH OF THE FOLLOWING THREE TABLES. COSTS INDICATED ARE THOSE COSTS OVER AND ABOVE DRAFT COUNTRY PLANS. TABULATED IN TABLES III-1, III-2 AND III-3 BELOW ARE PROPOSED GOALS FOR THE LAND, AIR AND MARITIME FORCES OF TURKEY. THOSE PROPOSALS MEETING SECDEF CRITERIA FOR WHICH COSTS HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED AMOUNT TO 15,863 MILLION TURKISH LIRA. THAT AMOUNT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE REMAINING COSTS OF PROPOSALS WHICH MET THE SECDEF CRITERIA FOR U.S. PRIORITY ONE, BUT FOR WHICH COSTS HAVE NOT BEEN AVAILABLE.

2. FOR U.S. PRIORITY ONE PROPOSALS, ESTABLISHED IN ACCORDANCE WITH CRITERIA OUTLINED IN SECDEF STATEMENTS TO NATO. THE U.S. TYPE CODES SHOWN ON THE TABLES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

TYPE CODE	PURPOSE OF PROPOSAL
M	MAINTAIN THE CURRENT SIZE AND READINESS OF FORCES, REPLACING WORN-OUT OR OBSOLETE EQUIPMENT AS NEEDED.
NC	MAKE IMPROVEMENTS THAT HAVE LITTLE OR NO COST.
R/S	TAKE ADVANTAGE OF EFFICIENCIES GAINED THROUGH RATIONALIZATION AND SPECIALIZATION OF FORCES.

AT IMPROVE ANTI-ARMOR DEFENSES.
AD IMPROVE CLOSE IN AIR DEFENSE.
AP IMPROVE AIRCRAFT PROTECTION THROUGH SHELTERS
AND DISPERSAL.
EW IMPROVE ECM/ECCM CAPABILITIES.
WR INCREASE WAR RESERVES, ESPECIALLY
PRECISION MUNITIONS.

FYI: US POSTURE ON EXTERNAL ASSISTANCE FOR TURKEY.
BECAUSE ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY IS A MATTER FOR
BILATERAL NOT MULTILATERAL DISCUSSIONS, YOU SHOULD NOT
RAISE THE EXTENT OF US PROGRAMS IN THE DRC. AS APPRO-
PRIATE, YOU MIGHT MENTION

THAT AS TURKEY'S ECONOMY CONTINUES TO EXPAND, TURKEY
WOULD BE EXPECTED TO CONTINUE TO ASSUME AN INCREASING
SHARE OF ITS DEFENSE NEEDS FROM ITS OWN RESOURCES. NONE-
THELESS, IT IS RECOGNIZED THAT AT THE PRESENT STAGE OF
TURKEY'S ECONOMY SOME EXTERNAL ASSISTANCE (US AND THIRD
COUNTRIES) WILL BE REQUIRED IF TURKEY IS TO HAVE A VIABLE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 06 STATE 058907

FUTURE MILITARY PROGRAM. TO ASSIST TURKEY IN MAINTAINING
NATO FORCES CAPABLE OF RESISTING WARSAW PACT AGGRESSION
THE US HAS PROVIDED SOME DOLLARS 3 BILLION OF MILITARY
ASSISTANCE SINCE 1950. ALTHOUGH IT IS ANTICIPATED THAT
GRANT AID TO TURKEY WILL BE DECLINING, WE ANTICIPATE THAT
SUBSTANTIAL U.S. FOREIGN MILITARY SALES CREDITS WILL
BECOME AVAILABLE. SUBJECT TO CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL, WE
PROJECT A TOTAL YEARLY ASSISTANCE PACKAGE FOR FY 76-80
OF DOLLARS 150 MILLION TO DOLLARS 200 MILLION, OF
WHICH ABOUT 40 PERCENT WILL CONSTITUTE GRANT ASSISTANCE
IN FY 76, AND A DECLINING PERCENTAGE IN SUBSEQUENT
YEARS. TURKEY'S PRESENT GENERATION OF MILITARY EQUIP-
MENT IS FAST BECOMING OBSOLETE. WITH RECOGNITION OF
THIS, TURKEY HAS TAKEN POSITIVE ACTION AND HAS EMBARKED
ON A NATIONALLY FUNDED REORGANIZATION AND MODERNIZATION
PROGRAM. NEVERTHELESS, THE MODERNIZATION AS WELL AS
IMPLEMENTATION OF NATO FORCE GOALS WILL REQUIRE EXTERNAL
ASSISTANCE. THE WILLINGNESS OF TURKEY'S ALLIES TO PRO-
VIDE SUBSTANTIAL MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND MILITARY SALES
CREDITS WILL LARGELY DETERMINE THE SUCCESS OF THIS
EFFORT. IN THIS RESPECT IT IS NOTED THAT THE CALL IN
AD-70 FOR ASSISTANCE IN STRENGTHENING TURKISH FORCES IS
STILL VALID. THE RESPONSE TO THAT CALL HAS NOT BEEN
OVERWHELMING. END FYI.

TABLE III-1: HIGHEST PRIORITY FORCE PROPOSALS

TABLE III-1: HIGHEST PRIORITY FORCE PROPOSALS

COUNTRY: TURKEY FORCE: LAND

1975-80

PROPOSAL COST OVER AND ABOVE MC
 SERIAL NO. COUNTRY PLANS (MTL) PRIORITY U.S. TYPE CODE
 1L01 4066(1) I WR
 1L02 473 I AT
 1L04 COSTS NOT AVAILABLE I EW
 1L05 600,0 I M
 1L06 C I EW
 1L07 C I AD
 1L10 518 I WR
 1L12 598.2 (1) II WR
 1L14 COSTS NOT AVAILABLE I R/S
 TOTALS: 5 AT 6255
 SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 07 STATE 058907

2 AT COSTS NOT AVAILABLE
 2 FOR WHICH COSTS INCLUDED IN COUNTRY PLANS
 (1) COST ESTIMATES APPEAR TO BE HIGHER THAN WOULD BE
 NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE 30 DAY STOCKS OF WAR RESERVE
 MUNITIONS.

TABLE III-2: HIGHEST PRIORITY FORCE PROPOSALS

COUNTRY: TURKEY FORCE: AIR

1975-80 COST OVER AND ABOVE
 PROPOSAL COUNTRY PLANS (TURKISH MC U.S.
 SERIAL NO. LIRE IN MILLIONS) PRIORITY TYPE CODE
 1A04 (1) 0 I EW
 1A05A (2) 306.9 I EW
 1A05B (2) 1,370.4 I EW
 1A05C (2) 402.2 I EW
 1A05D (2) 179.9 I EW
 1A06 620 (3) I WR
 1A07 4.2 I NC
 1A08 2,126. I AD
 1A09A 95 (3) I WR, AT
 1A09B 5 (3) I WR, NC
 1A09C 23 (3) I WR
 1A09D 27 (3) I WR, AT
 1A09E 10 I NC
 1A13 25 II AD
 1A14 722 I AD
 1A15 70 II M, NC
 1A17 COSTS NOT AVAILABLE II NC
 1A21 COSTS NOT AVAILABLE II NC
 1A22A COSTS NOT AVAILABLE II EW, NC
 1A22B COSTS NOT AVAILABLE II EW, NC
 1A22C COSTS NOT AVAILABLE II EW, NC
 1A23 COSTS NOT AVAILABLE II EW, NC
 1A28 287 II AP

TOTALS: 17 AT 6,273.6
 6 AT COSTS NOT AVAILABLE

- (1) CHANGE TO READ "INVESTIGATE AND DETERMINE COST TO PROVIDE ..."
- (2) PREFERENCE FOR PROVISION OF EW EQUIPMENT SHOULD BE GIVEN TO NEWER MODEL AIRCRAFT AS THEY ARE INTRODUCED INTO THE INVENTORY. IT WOULD ALSO BE PREFERABLE,
- SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 08 STATE 058907

WHERE SUCH A CHOICE IS AVAILABLE, TO APPLY FUNDING TO OBTAINING REPLACEMENTS FOR OLDER MODEL AIRCRAFT RATHER THAN TO PROVIDING EW EQUIPMENT FOR OLDER MODEL AIRCRAFT.

- (3) COST ESTIMATES APPEAR TO BE HIGHER THAN WOULD BE NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE 30 DAY STOCKS OF WAR RESERVE MUNITIONS.

TABLE III-3: HIGHEST PRIORITY FORCE PROPOSALS

COUNTRY: TURKEY FORCE: MARITIME

1975-80

PROPOSAL	COST OVER AND ABOVE	MC	U.S.
SERIAL NO.	COUNTRY PLANS (MTL)	PRIORITY	TYPE CODE
1M03A	C I M		
1M04A	1,893.9 I AD		
1M04C (1)	COSTS NOT AVAILABLE	I	M
1M07	235.0 (2) I WR		
1M12	587.6 I EW		
1M14	C II NC		
1M15	588.0 II M		
1M16	30.0 II M		

TOTALS: 5 AT 3,334.5

1 AT COSTS NOT AVAILABLE

2 FOR WHICH COSTS INCLUDED IN COUNTRY PLANS

- (1) BECAUSE OF THE GREATER COST OF PROCURING DESTROYERS AND BECAUSE TOTAL EXPENDITURES UNDER THE US HIGHEST PRIORITY PROPOSALS EXCEED THE "REASONABLE CHALLENGE" CALCULATED FOR TURKEY, THE TURKS MIGHT CONSIDER REPLACING DESTROYERS WITH FAST PATROL BOATS.
- (2) COST ESTIMATES APPEAR TO BE HIGHER THAN WOULD BE NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE 30 DAY STOCKS OF WAR RESERVE MUNITIONS.

SECTION IV: ANALYSIS AND U.S. PROPOSAL

1. COST OF PROPOSED U.S. PRIORITY ONE GOALS.

A. THE TOTAL COST OF U.S. SUGGESTED PRIORITY ONE LAND, AIR AND MARITIME DRAFT FORCE GOALS, OVER AND ABOVE CURRENT TURKISH COUNTRY PLANS, IS 15,863 MILLION TURKISH LIRA. COSTS WERE FROM 1240.5/20-2-3/S 60/73, UPDATED BY ANNEX TO AC/281(LF)N(74)1.

B. ACCORDINGLY, IF ACCEPTED, THE U.S. PROPOSED FORCE GOALS FOR TURKEY WOULD REQUIRE AN EXPENDITURE INCREASE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 09 STATE 058907

OVER AND ABOVE ESTIMATED CURRENT NATIONAL PLANS (80,378 MILLION TURKISH LIRA) OF ABOUT TWENTY PERCENT. THAT AMOUNT MIGHT BE TOO GREAT A BURDEN COMPARED TO THE 12.5 CALCULATED IN SECTION II AS COMPRISING A "REASONABLE CHALLENGE."

C. THE TABLE BELOW SUMMARIZES THE TOTAL COSTS OF U.S. PROPOSED PRIORITY ONE LAND, AIR, AND MARITIME DRAFT FORCE GOALS, OVER AND ABOVE CURRENT TURKISH COUNTRY PLANS, AND COMPARES THAT TOTAL TO THE ADDITIONAL AMOUNT THAT COULD BE SPENT WERE THE TURKS TO ACCEPT AS A REASONABLE CHALLENGE AN EXPENDITURE THROUGH 1980 OF THE SAME PERCENT OF GNP AS NOW DEVOTED TO DEFENSE, OR 10,053 MILLION TURKISH LIRA.

TABLE IV: ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR DRAFT FORCE GOALS

(MILLION TURKISH LIRA)

AVAILABLE 1975-1980 AT CURRENT PERCENT

OF GNP	10,053
--------	--------

LESS IDENTIFIED COSTS OF US PRIORITY

ONE PROPOSALS	15,863
---------------	--------

BALANCE AVAILABLE (DEFICIT)	- 5,810
-----------------------------	---------

2. TURKISH ABILITY TO INCREASE EXPENDITURES.

A. THE TURKISH GOVERNMENT HAS ESTIMATED THAT EXTERNAL AID WOULD BE NECESSARY FOR IT TO ADOPT ALL OF THE MC PROPOSALS, BUT IT HAS IMPLIED THAT NATIONAL RESOURCES MIGHT BE ABLE TO SUPPORT PROPOSALS COSTING AS MUCH AS 12,361 MILLION TURKISH LIRA OVER CURRENT COUNTRY PLANS (AC/281(LF)N(74)1).

B. THIS IS MORE THAN THE ADDITIONAL AMOUNT OVER COUNTRY PLANS THAT COULD BE SPENT WERE THE TURKS TO ACCEPT OUR REASONABLE CHALLENGE.

3. THE U.S. SHOULD, THEREFORE, PROPOSE THAT:

A. TURKEY, ALONG WITH THE OTHER NATO COUNTRIES, ADOPT AS A GOAL THE MAINTENANCE OF A CONSTANT SHARE OF GNP TO NATIONAL DEFENSE. HAVING A RELATIVELY LOW GNP DOES NOT MEAN THAT A CONSTANT SHARE OF GNP CANNOT BE DEVOTED TO DEFENSE.

B. TURKEY ACCEPT AS DRAFT FORCE GOALS ALL LISTED FORCE PROPOSALS FOR WHICH (A) COSTS OVER AND ABOVE PRESENT COUNTRY PLANS HAVE BEEN FULLY IDENTIFIED, AND (B) SUCH COSTS CAN BE ACCOMMODATED WITHIN A "REASONABLE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 10 STATE 058907

CHALLENGE" DERIVED BY THE METHOD DETAILED IN SECTION II ABOVE;

C. TURKEY CONSIDER WHICH, IF ANY, OF THE FORCE PROPOSALS IN COUNTRY PLANS BUT EXCLUDED FROM THE LIST OF U.S. PROPOSED FORCE GOALS IT MIGHT WISH TO ACCEPT AS PRIORITY TWO OR THREE, OR DROP ALTOGETHER;
D. TO THE EXTENT THAT FUNDS MIGHT BE RELEASED BY SUCH DECISIONS, TURKEY CONSIDER ACCEPTING AS PRIORITY ONE AND REALLOCATING FREED FUNDS TO SOME ADDITIONAL ITEMS ON THE LIST OF U.S. PROPOSED FORCE GOALS; AND
E. FIRST PRIORITY BE GIVEN TO THOSE PROPOSALS CARRYING THE HIGHEST MC PRIORITY AND APPEARING IN THE LIST OF U.S. PROPOSED FORCE GOALS.
4. WASHINGTON WILL CONTINUE TO KEEP THE EVALUATION OF NATO FORCE GOALS UNDER CAREFUL REVIEW IN THE LIGHT OF DEVELOPMENTS REPORTED BY THE MISSION AND WILL BE PREPARED TO SUPPLEMENT OR REVISE GUIDANCE AS MAY BE CONSIDERED APPROPRIATE.

KISSINGER

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MILITARY BUDGET, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS, COLLECTIVE SECURITY AGREEMENTS, FOREIGN POLICY POSITION, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 23 MAR 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974STATE058907
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: CVMCLAUGHLIN:GP
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D740063-0256
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740319/aaaaarsp.tel
Line Count: 457
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ORIGIN EUR
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 9
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: (A) STATE 42348, (B) MCM-14-74, (C), USNATO 1262
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 01 APR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <01 APR 2002 by collinp0>; APPROVED <05 JUN 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: NATO FORCE PROPOSALS/GOALS 1975-80 TURKEY
TAGS: MCAP, TU, US, NATO
To: NATO BRUSSELS
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005